

CANADA
— AND —
THE UNITED STATES
COMPARED

WITH PRACTICAL NOTES

ON

COMMERCIAL UNION

UNRESTRICTED RECIPROCITY

And ANNEXATION

BY

P. N. FACKTZ

TORONTO

THE TORONTO NEWS COMPANY

1889

225642.
11. 1. 29.

CANADA
AND
THE UNITED STATES
COMPARED
WITH PRACTICAL NOTES

ON
COMMERCIAL UNION
UNRESTRICTED RECIPROCITY
AND ANNEXATION

BY
P. N. FACKTZ

TORONTO
THE TORONTO NEWS COMPANY
1889

PRINTED BY
C. BLACKETT ROBINSON,
5 Jordan St., Toronto.

PREFACE.

THE writer of the following pages is an Anglo-American who has lived under the institutions of both Canada and the United States, and is familiar with the practical working of both systems of government.

The proposal of emissaries of the United States, and certain Canadians, acting in concert with them, that these two countries should form a "commercial union" or establish "unrestricted reciprocity" makes it desirable for the Canadian people, before entering into an entangling alliance of this character, to have placed before them the advantages they now enjoy; the probable results which would flow from closer union with the United States, and the social, moral and religious influences certain to be exerted by it.

The people of the Dominion ought to be able to decide whether their institutions, established by reflection and choice—with the wise safeguards by which they are surrounded—are such as to ensure them the full blessings of constitutional liberty. Under their system of responsible government no injustice can now be done them which they are not able to promptly remedy. Their geographical position on the map of the world, their soil, climate and productions, are immutably fixed by the law of Nature, and must remain, whatever their polity may be.

The proposition that they should surrender their commercial independence into the keeping of a foreign power (which might use it as a pretext for interfering in their affairs and endangering their liberties) is one which can only be justified on the ground that, in the opinion of those who make it, the Canadian people are incapable of self-government.

It is, therefore, of the utmost importance, that they should now decide this question, *wisely* and *finally*, for on their decision depend not only their own safety, welfare and independence, but the fate of an empire, embracing half a continent, rapidly rising

PREFACE.

in power and importance, and destined, if wisdom and patriotism guide their deliberations, to become one of the mighty nations of the earth.

Well did the poet foresee with prophetic vision, and, nearly half a century ago, proclaim her present and her future greatness:

" I view thee not at natal hour,
But ages hence, thy mighty power,
When the fleet iron horse shall roar
From Nootka Sound to Labrador:
When thy broad belt rich commerce spans.
To bear thy products to other lands,
And millions have found happy homes
Where now the untamed Buffalo roams;
When teeming cities, hamlets fair,
And all the arts of peace are there;
When college, school and churches' spires
All glitter in solstitial fires;
When mountain, mine and spreading plain
Diffuse their wealth from main to main,
And jarring races fused in one
Rejoice in name Canadian."

The epitome of the constitution of the United States is added with practical illustrations of the character of its guardianship of the liberties of its own people—the protection to life and property it affords—the administration of justice under it, and the kind of morality and religion it promotes, for the purpose of showing the Canadian people the vast superiority of their own form of government, and why those who prefer the government of the States ought to prove their patriotism by

" Leaving their country for their country's good,"
and going where they may with kindred spirits

" Float awhile, by varying eddies born,
And sink at last forever."

THE DOMINION OF CANADA.

“Canada, know that thou art free ;
Free as the mountain breeze can be ;
No lordly tethers bind thy sons,
No privileged power thee cramps or s uns,
No federal tyrant now can sway
Thy realms, and degradations lay
On water, fish, land, birds or air ;
All are thine for thy future care.”

CANADA is unquestionably one of the freest and best governed countries in the world. No other people, unless perchance it be some other colony of the British Empire, enjoy the same security of life and property, the same control of taxation, and the same absolute responsibility of the official ministry to the will of the majority. No burdens can be imposed upon them which they do not freely sanction, no policy can be pursued by the government without the approval of a majority of their representatives. To me this appears to be in the highest and truest sense, “Government by the people for the people.”

The Governor-General, as the representative of the Crown, belongs to no party, or faction, but is chosen for his fitness to discharge the duties of the Vice-Regal office with dignity and impartiality. He has no power to encroach upon the liberties of the people if he had the disposition. His functions begin and end with the administration of their own laws, under the restrictions of their own constitution.

In all the affairs of life—in business, in religion, in their estimate of obligations and duties, men will honestly differ in opinion, and it is but natural they should do so in

politics. Freedom of the press and free speech exist in Canada in the highest degree. The open discussion of all questions of governmental policy, taxation and expenditure, by the two great political parties, keeps alive the interest of the people in public affairs, and informs them on all questions which can affect them favourably or otherwise.

Parliament, or the law-making power, is composed of the people's representatives, freely chosen by their votes, and fairly representing their will. Bribery, intimidation, and all unfair means of influencing the votes of electors, are prevented by legal enactments of a more stringent character than exist anywhere outside of Britain and her colonies.

The union of the several provinces, while leaving to each perfect freedom of action in purely local affairs, welded together all the British possessions on this continent in one grand Dominion for mutual defence, commercial freedom, economical administration, and national development.

Such is the Government of Canada as it appears to me. Its fruits are seen in the rapid growth which has taken place since the union, in the evidences of prosperity which exist on every hand, and in the sobriety and moral and religious tone of the people—no where else is the Sabbath day observed with greater devotion, or a more decent regard for the Christian faith.

“ With pride I see thee dare to soar
 In noble aims and classic lore,
 In foremost rank assume to stand
 Where genius, science, wave their wand,
 Thy primal schools and normal more
 Scatter the seeds of mental power ;
 Models the youthful mind to train
 And free from Superstition's bane,
 While higher schools inviting stand,
 Offered with a liberal hand.

Great public works attest thy growth;
 Thy innate energy and worth,
 In arts, canals, and mineral wealth;
 In railroads, mines, commercial health;
 In boundless riches unexplored,
 In fertile plains and valleys broad;
 In fisheries and forest wealth,
 In bracing air and blooming health,
 From Atlantic to Pacific's shore,
 No pen can half recount thy store."

In the extent of her domain Canada exceeds the United States. In the strength of her position she is incomparably superior—being practically unassailable from the east, north and west, while the American states are open to attack on every side. She possesses the largest area of unsettled lands, available for cultivation, of any nation on the globe. Her forests of timber are unequalled in extent and value. Her resources in iron and coal are of incalculable magnitude, and as yet only slightly developed, while she possesses vast riches in mines of gold and silver, copper and lead,—quarries of granite and marble, inexhaustible beds of salt, and the finest fisheries in the world.

"A thousand miles of genial clime,
 From North to South they all are thine;
 From East to West three thousand more
 Stretch gorgeously from shore to shore;
 And prairie, forest, lake and stream
 Alternate like a poet's dream.

With pent-up wealth thy bowels heave,
 Inviting all men to receive;
 Coal, copper, silver, iron, lead,
 And zinc and gold diffusely spread
 O'er mountain, plain and prairie van,
 Where flows the Great Saskatchewan.

Where'er I rove the vast expanse—
 Mountains and plain in distant glance,
 Rivers in sunlight sparkling flow,
 And forests dark majestic grow,—
 With smiling plains and valleys fair
 Inviting Cultivation's care.

Then rouse thee to thy high behest,
 Thy destiny by God impressed,
 To guide the ship and clear the way,
 And timely fix thy Sovereign's sway,
 Before the brightest, purest gem
 In her Royal diadem
 Be snatched by fillibus ing bands,
 And pass to hostile, rival hands,
 When dwarf'd and dwindl'd thou shalt be,
 Covered with shame and infamy."

What can a people, so blessed with boundless wealth, want which they have not already in unequalled abundance? Their Government is of their own making, their rulers of their own choice, and changeable at their will. To guard and develop such a vast inheritance, they must be willing to bear some burdens, yet their taxes are lighter than those borne by the people of the States. Their tariff is lighter than the American tariff. Their soil is as rich, their climate as good, and their security in life and property much greater. If they are capable of self-government at all, and worthy of the name and fame of the glorious empire from which they sprung, they will unite as one man in upholding the Dominion and working out her grand destiny.

Vast as are the resources of Canada, their possession is of little value to her people until they are developed and made to yield up their wealth. This can be efficiently and quickly done only by increasing her population. To do this, she must seek to attract emigrants from the populous countries of Europe, the British Islands, and the United States, by holding out inducements equal or superior to those offered by other countries. No emigrants are more desirable than those from Germany and the Scandinavian kingdoms, who are accustomed to a more rigorous climate than that of Canada, and are both thrifty and industrious. Danes, Norwegians and Swedes make excellent citizens. There are many large settlements of them in the United States, and they remind one, in looks, in habits, and in their moral characteristics, more of English people than

any other. Thousands of Englishmen, Scotchmen and Irishmen are each year led to settle in the States, who would be much better off if they came to Canada. In the Western States, a restless and dissatisfied feeling prevails among the emigration of late years, caused by the scarcity of good Government lands, and the high prices of those held by railway companies and land sharks. Even the old pioneer farmers are many of them so oppressed by taxes and burdened by debt that they are forced to sell their farms and seek new homes in Dakota or Canada. In Western Kansas whole settlements are breaking up, discouraged by the poorness of the soil, the uncertainty of the seasons, and the periodic visitations of insects which destroy everything before them. Encourage these people properly, and they will flock to the North-Western Provinces of the Dominion by thousands, and, once the tide fairly sets in, and they come to know that they can have better land, and a better Government, in Canada than in the States, nothing the latter can do to prevent will stop the Western exodus.

The growth of Canada, within a comparatively short period, from a few weak and scattered settlements, along the southern border of her immense possessions, into a nation of five millions of freemen, with splendid railways, rich and populous cities, grand canals, and factories which produce within herself almost everything required by her people, is something of which every Canadian may well feel proud.

To continue and complete her development, she must cultivate among her people a love of country, which shall lift them above the low plane of sectional and party politics, into the purer and higher atmosphere of great national aims and ambitions.

In this respect, Canadians cannot do better than emulate the love of country of the Americans. With all the glaring defects of their written constitution, every American proclaims and believes it superior to all others. Dem-

ocrats and Republicans alike sink all party differences, the moment their nationality is touched. They never drag their institutions into the mire of party politics, but vie with each other in upholding them against the world.

The effect of this is seen in the tens of millions of people, attracted from the populations of the old world, and in the thousands of millions of foreign capital, which have been flowing into their country for the past fifty years. The people and capitalists of Europe took them at their own estimate of themselves, and felt that a Government enshrined in the hearts of her people afforded the best guarantee, not only of its own stability and prosperity, but of the security of investments.

This national spirit gave them the confidence of the world and made possible their wonderful growth in population and wealth. It was not their form of Government which forced wealth upon them, for it came in defiance of probably the most oppressive constitution and corrupt administration ever tolerated by a civilized people.

Canadians have much more to be proud of in their institutions, and possess everything which Americans possessed to invite immigration and capital. If these come to them more slowly, and with a certain degree of hesitation and distrust, they have only themselves to blame. They have fostered a class of journalists and pestilent politicians who persistently defame their country, its institutions, its laws, and its people,—misrepresenting everything Canadian and everything British.

The injury which these men have done, and are now doing, is beyond calculation. Their falsehoods are on file in all the centres of Europe from which emigration flows, and are read by intending emigrants seeking to learn what kind of a country Canada is, and what their chances would be of making prosperous homes for their families by emigrating to it. When they are told that the people are dissatisfied with their lot and would be more prosperous under the Government of the States, and come to

know that the papers which assert this are the recognized organs of one of the political parties of the country, what can they think but that Canada is an unsafe country to go to, and the States much to be preferred?

Remember, too, that these intending emigrants know nothing of Canada, or her institutions, or the prosperity of her people, except what they see in the journals of the country. Let the reader put himself in the place of the emigrant, and say what would be his decision after reading these misrepresentations put forth from week to week, and month to month! Why, naturally you would say, If that is the character of the Government of Canada, and such the condition of the people that they are forced to beg for reciprocal trade, or some kind of commercial union with the States, as necessary to their prosperity, it is no country for me to settle in. Thus every Canadian is injured by these national defamers, for there is no interest which is not benefited by the influx of immigration. It quickens every branch of business, and would afford Canadian factories and farmers a home market for everything they produce.

“’Tis what has made thy neighbour great ;
 Built his cities, given him might
 To construct railroads, dig canals,
 And man his navy’s wooden walls,
 Filled his armies, commerce, mines,
 And furnished means for worse designs.
 The annual impulsive power
 That scatters blessings like a shower ;
 Four hundred thousand foreigners,
 Yearly seeking wealth and honours,
 Bring each a hundred dollars’ wealth,
 Besides their brawny limbs and health ;
 Her industries aid, bless, impel,
 And onward Western current swell.

Why not thine, or does wisdom fail ?
 No patriot breezes swell thy sail.
 Then turn this stream into thy West,
 And thus accomplish all the rest ;

The poet's vision realize
 In this portentous enterprise,
 Which can transmute crude Nature's store
 To teeming cities scattered o'er
 Thy Western wilds' utmost bound,
 And smiling plenty strew around
 Each mountain, plain and forest home
 Where now wild elk and buffalo roam."

Not only do these croaking and lying newspapers frighten away immigration from Canada, but they exert a still more injurious influence on capitalists. Money is the most sensitive of all immigrants. It will not trust itself in any land which has not a stable Government and national prosperity. No capitalist, after reading the statements put forth and believing them to be true, would ever give a second thought to Canada as a safe field for investments.

Americans, not personally acquainted with the institutions or people of Canada, have been led by these papers to think and speak of Canadians as though they were an inferior race, incapable of self-government, having no national character, no love of country, no attachment to their institutions, and, sooner or later, sure to become a dependency of the Republic.

Deny the correctness of this opinion, and they point you to a string of paragraphs, cut from Canadian papers, affirming in substance everything they assume to be true. "Why," said an American to me the other day, "here is a paragraph from a Toronto paper, giving the number of young men who, within a stated period, have left a certain Canadian town and gone to the States and done well. What does that show, but that some of your papers are actually encouraging young Canadians to seek their fortunes in the States, and holding out to them the assurance of bettering their lot by doing so? Were one of our editors to do that, to induce young Americans to go to Canada, he would be mobbed by the people. They would cast his press and types into the street, and give him so

many hours to get out of the country! The very fact that Canadians submit to such an outrage is proof, to my mind, of their want of national pride and spirit."

That great numbers of Canadians have gone to the States, in the hope of bettering their lot, is true, but it is also true that most of them found it an *ignis fatuus*, which lured them from comfort and plenty to privation and misery.

Go to Detroit, Chicago, Milwaukee or St. Paul, and you can find hundreds of these poor Canadians living from hand to mouth, willing to work at any menial employment, and yet hardly able to obtain the necessaries of life. A friend of mine having a property near Chicago hired four young Canadians last Spring. They were intelligent, and competent to fill responsible clerkships, but were glad enough to get three dollars and a half a week for the hardest kind of manual labour—mixing and carrying mortar, lumber and brick—and he could have hired a thousand men at the same wages. Many unfortunate Canadians are railroaded into American workhouses as vagrants, because they cannot find employment to provide them with shelter and food. Where one Canadian does well by going to such cities as Chicago, ten find themselves much worse off than they were in Canada.

The Western States are flooded over with tramps, who go from farm to farm seeking employment they cannot find, and generally begging their bread. It was estimated by the Chicago papers last winter that there were *forty thousand* men out of employment in that city alone, and among them were hundreds of young Canadians, who cursed the day they were lured from their comfortable homes by the false representations of Canadian newspapers. Some of these are, no doubt, those referred to by the Toronto papers as having "*gone to the States and done well!*" They remain only because they are too poor or too proud to return in rags to their Canadian friends.

How long will the Canadian people permit their news-

papers, for party purposes, to thus defame them? What can it do but injury to their country and to themselves? This Canada is theirs, and its good name should be cherished by them as a sacred trust. They made the government, enacted the laws, and hold the administration in their hands. Its future depends largely on the estimation in which it is held by other peoples. Whoever assails it assails them individually, and should be treated as a renegade, dangerous and disloyal to their country.

It has ever been the yearning desire of the United States to possess Canada. The Canadian people, therefore, cannot be too much on their guard against any and every proposition emanating from that source. After rudely tearing up all former commercial treaties between the two countries, rejecting all friendly overtures for their renewal, legislating additional restrictions on Canadian trade, and perpetrating outrage after outrage on her people, —even to the commission of piracy on the high seas, we are now told by Wiman, Hitt, and Butterworth, three Yankee politicians, and their Canadian coadjutors, that this rude and aggressive Republic has suddenly so far reformed as to be now actually willing to enter into some kind of a “*commercial union*” with Canada. And they kindly tell us how desirous they are, personally, to see it established,—*for the good of Canada!*

This sounds very disinterested, and is so contrary to all past experience, that it is perhaps wise to enquire what the true character of this latest American scheme is, the antecedents of those advocating it, and the probabilities which exist for any fair, and safe plan of commercial intercourse being conceded to Canada.

What is meant by “*commercial union*” with the States? It means that Canada shall adopt the American tariff against the Mother Country, and all the outside world, and agree to give to the States the *unrestricted* benefit of the Dominion market for her productions. To do this, Canada must practically abandon all right of pro-

tection against the encroachments of the Republic, and must give up the revenues now derived from duties, for everything from the States would come in free,—and the bulk of foreign importations would be filtered through the States, after paying duty into the American treasury, and commissions to Americans merchants. No other arrangement would be practicable, without maintaining the whole present expense, and machinery, of the Customs department. The stress laid on the term “*unrestricted*” is no doubt meant to prepare the Canadian mind for this very solution.

Having taken the revenue derived from duties from the Dominion, the Canadian people must next submit to direct taxation, levying so much on the dollar on all assessable property to support their government, so that any uncertain benefits which might be derived from free trade on the one hand would be much more than offset by the certain loss and injury on the other.

Reciprocal trade in fish, lumber, coal, iron, grains, live stock, butter, cheese and other products of the farm, forest, mines and fisheries, the Dominion Government has always been in favour of, but the Americans will not have that. The kind of free trade they want is not in natural products but in manufactures! Those of Canada are of recent growth, and, as yet, comparatively weak. They were called into existence by the guarantee of protection afforded by the adoption of the National Policy. Under this policy she has made giant strides in development, and acquired by it everything necessary to national independence. She has so increased in wealth, and in the promise of future greatness, as to excite the jealousy of the American Republic, which would much rather see her weak and dependent.

That Commercial Union would not benefit the *farmers* of Canada is proved by the fact that they are already better off than American farmers and better than they would be under the high American tariff. The American

farmers are generally *poor* and so over-burdened by mortgage incumbrances on their farms that many in every community, who a few years ago owned the fee simple of their homesteads, are now only *tenants* of the loan companies. Throughout the Western States, and especially in Iowa, Illinois, Indiana and Ohio, three-fourths of the farms are covered by mortgages, bearing *seven* and even *eight* per cent. interest, and the day is not distant when most of them will be sold under the hammer. Thirty years ago American farmers were generally prosperous, but now their monstrous tariff and heavy state and country taxes barely let them live.

Wheat is generally higher in Canada, and reciprocity would lower it to the American price. *Beef, mutton* and *pork*, in bulk and on foot, are higher in Toronto than in Chicago or Kansas City, the great meat centres of the west. *Barley* and *heavy horses* are slightly higher in the States, but only because both are in demand beyond the home supply, and cannot be procured without paying the duty. Take off the duty and the American price would fall to the Canadian price. *Butter* and *cheese* are largely exported from the States to England, which regulates the American price, and the British market is just as open to Canadians now as it would be under reciprocity. *Lumber* is considerably dearer in the States, and the removal of the duty would increase the cost in Canada of all farm improvements, houses, barns, fences, etc.

From actual observation I know that the Canadian farmer is better off than the American. He gets as much or more in the aggregate for his crops and buys the merchandise he needs for his family considerably cheaper.

"*Unrestricted Reciprocity*" would benefit nobody but the *rings* of manufacturers in the States. These, I have no doubt, would be glad to enter into an enterprise by which they could obtain *five millions more consumers!* They are older, more numerous, and more wealthy than the Canadian manufacturers and their capacities, in al-

most every branch of manufacture, exceed the demands of their own country. They could blot out of existence all the millions of Canadian capital now invested in manufactures by simply flooding the country with American goods below the cost of production. This would throw hundreds of thousands of Canadian operatives out of employment, bankrupt their employers, and make the Government hated.

The American rings would, I am sure, be willing and glad to take the contract to accomplish this, for they could then put up prices, to recoup themselves, as soon as they had secured the market against Canadian competition.

Is there one Canadian base enough to enter into a vile conspiracy of this character with aliens and enemies for the wholesale robbery of those Canadians who, in good faith, invested their all in industries which have done so much to promote the prosperity of Canada and raised her from humble dependence upon other countries to the proud position of an independent and self-sustaining nation? If so, rely on it, capital so betrayed would never again risk a dollar on the faith of the people of Canada.

And suppose Canada were to enter into this scheme and found it injurious and unsatisfactory to her people, what assurance can we have that she would be *permitted* to peacefully withdraw from the tariff union? The grasping Republic, having practically separated her from the support of the Empire, would be very reluctant to relinquish five millions of subjects and the wealth of half a continent! By her aggressions she forced France to part with Louisiana, and Mexico to give up Texas, New Mexico and California, and could easily find a pretext for assailing the independence of Canada. Where could Canada then turn for assistance? She could not appeal to the Empire which she had practically abandoned, nor even rely on the united loyalty of her own people, for those Canadians who are now urging her to take this headlong plunge into a dangerous experiment would be the first to

advise her to pusillanimously surrender her independence without a struggle. Indeed it is hardly possible that they do not foresee this contingency and advocate the treacherous scheme for the very purpose of forcing the people into annexation.

Now for the originators of this scheme. What reason have those Canadians supporting it for believing it other than a conspiracy against the independence of Canada? Wiman, they tell us, was once a Canadian. Yes, a Canadian who foreswore his country, gave up his allegiance, and for personal gain became the subject of a foreign power. His chief occupation is organizing and managing rings of capitalists and manufacturers to put up the prices of necessities of life, so that he and his rich conspirators may grow richer and the poor be made poorer. Has such a character as this any right to interfere in the affairs of Canada? Is he one from whom the Canadian people can safely take advice regarding their future? Before they do so let them consider well the fable of the wicked spider and the silly fly. Wiman's web is spread out in beautiful meshes and made to look most attractive, but woe to the poor credulous fool who becomes entangled in it. He has confessed to his American associates why he is so anxious to promote this treacherous scheme, viz.: because he believes it "the high road" to the destruction of Canada's nationality and her absorption into the American Union! It is not her good but her *ruin* he is seeking to accomplish and the rôle of *traitor* is in perfect keeping with his renegade antecedents.

Butterworth and Hitt, his fellow-conspirators, are third-rate politicians of the party in power. They are not men of national reputation in any true sense. They belong to the same political organization as O'Donovan Rossa, Pat Ford, Egan, Finerty, Sullivan, and the whole gang of Fenians and Dynamiters. The spirit of their party, ever since its organization out of the debris of the Whigs and Know-nothings, in 1856, has been uncompromising hostility

to British and Canadian interests. At the last Presidential election the platform of their party affirmed the necessity of maintaining, and even *increasing*, the present American tariff against Canadian produce, lumber, coal, iron, fish, and every thing Canada has to sell.

There never was a time in the history of the Republic when its Government manifested so little disposition to favour any fair reciprocity with Canada, nor a party so pledged against conceding the least freedom of trade between the two countries as the party now in power, to which Wiman, Butterworth and Hitt belong. For Canada to supplicate for reciprocity, on the ground that it is necessary for the welfare of her people, is the very way not to get it. No sane man can suppose, from the spirit manifested by the Republic, that it desires or would do anything to promote the interests of a rival nation, competing with her in the markets of the world and rapidly rising in population and power on her borders. Instead of the good of Canada, she desires to cripple her trade, and bully and outrage her people to make them surrender their liberties, as the only means of obtaining peace. Nothing has conduced so much to create this very spirit of hostility to Canada as the discovery that she has become a successful competitor for the trans-continental trade between China and Europe, and is already beginning to absorb her own dissatisfied population. She foresees that the day is not distant when, if she cannot stop the national prosperity and development of Canada, hundreds of thousands of her own citizens will each year seek homes on Canadian soil.

No person in power in the States is in favour of honest commercial reciprocity between the two countries. The farmers of all the agricultural States gave their votes to the Republican party, because promised increased protection against Canadian farmers. The great lumber firms of Michigan, Wisconsin and Minnesota voted almost solidly for the same party, and compelled their employees to do likewise, because guaranteed that the present tariff

against Canadian lumber should be maintained. The coal and iron companies, and their operatives, supported the same party on the assurance of continued protection against Canadian coal and iron; and so in regard to fish and every other Canadian interest.

In the face of these indisputable facts, known to everybody, and the additional knowledge that the campaign resulted in the election of the Republican nominee to the Presidency and gave both branches of Congress to his party, it is not possible for any Canadian to believe there is a ghost of a chance of obtaining any kind of fair trade intercourse from the present American administration. The bare mention of such a thing by President Harrison, or any of his cabinet, would almost cause civil war. It would be regarded as such a breach of faith to the American farmers, lumbermen, miners and fishermen, who gave their votes, and money, to the party in power on the distinct pledge of maintaining the present or greater restriction against Canadian competition.

Therefore, the talk by Canadian papers and politicians about obtaining reciprocity or free trade with the States is, under existing circumstances, a sham and fraud upon the Canadian people. They know that it cannot be obtained, and they are not advocating it with any expectation of getting it, or of benefiting the Canadian farmer in any way, but merely as the clap-trap of party politics. The discussion of it even, and the reason assigned for desiring it, are alike insulting to the intelligence and injurious to the interests of this country—insulting because it assumes that the electors are incapable of seeing the transparent fraud of its advocacy, and injurious because it encourages the Americans to persevere in their hostility by making them believe the people of Canada are almost ready to barter their national existence for the stale pottage of a little more trade.

It may be hard for the people to believe those Canadians advocating *commercial union* and *unrestricted reci-*

proximity are disloyal, and, under the pretence of free trade, are actually aiming at the subversion of the institutions of their country; but it is equally hard for them to understand what other, and better, purpose they can have in view in pursuing precisely the course they would adopt if actually leagued with aliens and enemies in a treasonable conspiracy.

Manitoba is the field to which the Government of Canada is endeavouring to attract immigration. Imagine the intending immigrant to read the statements contained in an article recently published in a Toronto paper, not only without a word of dissent or disapproval, but with warm editorial commendation. The article in question contained sixteen distinct assaults upon the good name of Canada, all evidently intended to discourage emigration to Manitoba by creating the belief, in the minds of emigrants, that the people of that province were under a corrupt, wasteful and despotic government. That they were worse off by "*thirty-five per cent.*" than those in the American States of Dakota and Minnesota adjoining. That they have no outlet for their products. That "a farmer could have got four hundred dollars more for his wool if he had settled across the line in Dakota." That Manitoba is "outside the pale of continental commerce, and it is impossible for her to enjoy prosperity or gain population under the most wasteful and corrupt of governments."

Who, believing these statements, would think of settling in Manitoba? They are a direct attack upon every material interest of that province; and a wrong done to every one whose welfare depends on her prosperity and good name.

Manitoba and Dakota lie side by side, far from the manufacturing centres. Both are rich agricultural districts, and produce products which mainly depend for their price on foreign markets. The Dakota farmer buys eastern American implements and goods and the Manitoba farmer eastern Canadian. The prices paid by the Dakota farmer

for farm implements and other manufactures is quite as high as the Manitoba farmer pays. The freight charges on grain from Manitoba to the seaboard by the Canadian route are rather less than from Dakota to the seaboard by the American route. The foreign market, for everything they have to sell, is just as open to one as to the other. The land of Manitoba is better, the protection of life and property greater, and the taxes lighter than in Dakota.

It is, therefore, *not true* that the Dakota farmer is better off than the Manitoba farmer. This is proved by the fact that large numbers of them are moving across the line into Manitoba, and that thousands would gladly do so if they could sell their Dakota farms.

Neither is it true that the prices of farm implements are lower in Dakota than in Manitoba. The agents of the American manufacturers, in order to sell in Ontario and Manitoba, are forced to reduce the prices thirty-three and a third per cent., which is just about the amount of the duty. They do not do this to American farmers, but are compelled to do it in Manitoba and Ontario to compete with the Canadian manufacturers. The regular selling price in the States is fixed by *ring* combinations and there is really no competition. The American farmer is forced to pay the ring price. Ontario and Manitoba farmers get thirty-three and a third per cent. reduction, which enables them to pay the duty and get whatever real or imagined advantages there may be in American implements at the same price as American farmers pay. This is not only true of reapers, mowers, rakes, and seed-drills, but of ploughs and every kind of agricultural machinery. On the common American plough the reduction is *three dollars* to the Canadian farmer below the regular price paid for the same plough by Americans. Take down the tariff wall and all these implements would cost the regular ring price without any reduction whatever. The thirty-three and a third per cent. now goes towards the support of the Dominion Government without being any burden

to the people. Deprive the Government of that and the people would have to make it up in direct taxes.

The old established manufacturers of the States who have long enjoyed the benefits of a "*close pasture*" in that country and grown rich, could, no doubt, produce agricultural implements cheaper than the Canadian manufacturers, but the cost of their production is never considered in fixing *prices* that is done by a ring which is governed mainly by what it believes the farmer can be made to pay and his necessities.

Whether there would be any benefit to the Ontario or Manitoba farmer from reciprocal trade in natural products between the two countries, is difficult to determine. There would be, no doubt, small gains and losses on both sides. But, with regard to farm implements, the American price is now actually higher than the Canadian.

Therefore, the clamour raised by certain parties in Canada is not *honest* and not intended to benefit Canadian people. Its real animus is seen in its virulent attacks on the Dominion Government, the Governor-General, the Senate, and the individual ministers. It is the Government and institutions of Canada they are seeking to injure, not the people they are striving to benefit. They know the Dominion Government has no *power* to give reciprocity or free trade and the States no *intention* to do so. The Government of Canada has always been willing to enter into negotiations, but the American Government has steadily refused.

The agitation on this subject is unquestionably intended to cover other and less reputable projects. Or why do its advocates seek to excite bad blood and distrust between the several provinces? Why try to make Manitoba believe that she is injured by Ontario; Ontario, that she is injured by Quebec; Quebec, that all the other provinces are combined against her; and the Maritime Provinces that the Dominion Government sacrifices their special interest in coal, iron, and the fisheries, to please Ontario, Quebec, Manitoba, and British Columbia.

This certainly is not done to benefit the people, strengthen the Government, promote national growth, or subserve any Canadian interest. Then what is its purpose? It has all the characteristics of a treasonable conspiracy against the life of the Dominion, and if it be not one its Canadian advocates are most unfortunate in their co-workers who are known to be implacable haters of everything Canadian and British, and loud-mouthed advocates of annexation.

“Ye scheming tricksters of a day—
 Ye shallow plotters—your treason stay;
 Your treach’rous minds on party bent,
 On sordid selfishness intent,
 For lust of power and hope of gain,
 Have dared invoke sedition’s bane.
 Your dark ambition seeks to doom
 Fair freedom’s high hopes to the tomb,
 That you may ride the troubled sea,
 When all is sunk in anarchy.
 Such, Canada, will be thy fate,
 If not repelled before too late;
 Then rouse thee! Calmly look around,
 Let no small views thy vision bound;
 Thy safest motto e’re shall be
 Canada, Queen, and Liberty.”

No Canadian who desires the welfare of his country will ever consent to commit her destinies into the hands of any party which does not uphold her rights; protect her industries; strive to promote her growth, and develop her resources; defend her good name; glory in her achievements, and seek to strengthen her national aspirations as part of the proud empire to which she belongs. Every loyal Canadian loves—aye reverences—the constitutional bulwark of British liberty; regards it as an impregnable fortress, protecting him and all he loves and values; considers it the embodiment, and its flag the symbol, of honour, glory and grandeur; snuffs with delight its “odour of antiquity,” and never thinks or speaks of it with irrever-

ence, but ever devoutly prays that the grand old oak, which was to his ancestors, and is to him, may be to his posterity

“ From storms a shelter, and from heat a shade,”

and that his beloved Canada, under the ægis of the empire, may remain free and secure—alike from American anarchy and misrule, and despotisms, where

“ Civilization trembling stands
Midst bristling steel and martial bands.”

Canada possesses equal, if not greater, natural resources, and *two millions* more people, than the United States had when her national government was formed, and is just as able to work out her own destiny, and gain population, wealth and power. The States had no neighbour from whom to *beg* for *reciprocity* or *free trade*. She relied wholly on the energy, pluck and commercial enterprise of her own people—as Canada is now doing—and they opened up to her the trade of the world.

The only possible outcome of “ Commercial Union ” with the States is *annexation*, while *unrestricted reciprocity*, on the conditions announced by the American press as the only ones acceptable to their people, would practically make the Provinces of the Dominion so many States of the American Union, end in the subversion of their liberties, the extinction of responsible Government, and in reducing Canadians to the condition of serfs or slaves of a despotic oligarchy.

Before the Canadian people listen to such a monstrous proposition, let them calmly examine the character of the Government of that country—the kind of security it affords to life and property—the inequity of its administration—the irresponsibility of its executive to the people’s representatives—the despotic powers of its Senate, and lastly the moral and religious characteristics of those reared under its influence.

THE UNITED STATES.

IN no true sense can the United States be said to have a Government formed by a common people, and controlled in its functions by their will. As originally planned and established, it was a league or federation entered into by *thirteen separate and distinct nations* for mutual defence, economy in maintaining foreign relations, and commercial union.

Great Britain, in acknowledging the independence of her rebellious colonies, did so to each one separately, and thereby endowed each with all the attributes of national sovereignty.

These several colonies had previously made common cause with each other in maintaining a war against the Mother Country, but they did so only as *individual* colonies and were not united by any bond of union until after the termination of the revolutionary struggle and after the recognition of their sovereignty as independent nations.

ORIGIN AND NATURE OF THE FEDERAL UNION.

In 1778 the first federal compact or league of states was entered into, but it proved so defective and unsatisfactory that, in 1788, a convention composed of delegates from all the states assembled at Philadelphia to try to frame a more perfect union. The result of its deliberations was the recommendation of seven articles of agreement, which, upon being *accepted* and *ratified* by the states in their capacity as independent sovereignties, became the written bond of union or *constitution* of the United States.

It was never intended by the framers of the constitution to form a consolidated nation, with powers derived

from the people and subject to their will. That purpose was distinctly disclaimed in the convention, and had it not been, no union could have been effected. The avowed purpose was to establish a *federation* or *zollverein*, deriving its functions from independent states, which retained within themselves all sovereignty except the powers delegated to the central agency to be exercised for the welfare of all.

That this was the aim of the convention which settled the act of union, and the intended purpose of the several articles agreed upon, is indisputably proved by the interpretation put upon them by their advocates at the time of their adoption, and subsequently in recommending their ratification to their respective states.

These thirteen original states being at the time independent, and *intending to remain so*, delegated to a president and congress, as agents of the states, the several powers conferred by the constitution to be exercised for the common weal of the States.

Before the assent of all the states could be obtained, it was found necessary for the larger to concede to the smaller ones equal control in the Senate, a body specially designed to protect them against the preponderance of the former in the House of Representatives—which being directly elected by the people, it was feared, might, in time, seek to consolidate them into one common nation.

Such was the origin of the American Republic and such the reasons for the extraordinary powers conferred upon the President and Senate in its written constitution. It was to be a Government by *states* and not by the *people*. It was planned in the interest of the states, and all its safeguards were provided against the supposed danger of encroachments on state sovereignty by the people.

It seems therefore something in the nature of just retribution that the Central Government should, by usurpation, have extinguished, step by step, every vestige of state independence; and reduced these once proud nationalities

to the condition of subjected provinces, with no more power in their halls of legislation than is exercised by County Councils in Ontario.

LOSS OF SELF-GOVERNMENT BY THE PEOPLE.

But in this overturning of states rights what becomes of the people? In what way were they benefited or their liberties rendered secure? Under the monstrous injustice of the plan by which the president is elected and the senate constituted, they are deprived of the power of electing one or the other, and yet are held as subjects of the states—after all power has been taken from them and nothing but the machinery left—which is only retained as an instrument by which to deprive the people more completely of the power of controlling legislation by the House of Representatives.

The public will is in this way *nullified* and the policy desired by a majority of the people despotically overruled and wrongfully defeated.

We have an apt illustration of the truth of this in the issue of the late presidential election. President Cleveland was defeated and turned out of office, although he polled one hundred thousand more votes than his opponent, Harrison, who was declared *elected* to the presidency, although *defeated by one hundred thousand votes!* And for four years to come the latter will administer the Government against the known will of the majority.

Nor is this the chief part of the wrong which results. The principles and policy of the two great political parties were fully set forth in their respective platforms, and the people in voting for president did so as representative of that policy and those reforms which they desired carried out.

In all free Governments, and especially throughout the British Empire, the will of the majority of the electors is supreme. But such is not the case in the United States.

At the last election the issue was clearly defined. The democrats demanded lower taxation and relief from certain oppressive, and, as they believed, unnecessary burdens, while the republicans upheld the existing taxes and other burdens as necessary to the prosperity of the country. The democratic policy was carried by one hundred thousand majority, but the relief demanded was denied to the country, and the policy rejected by the people forced upon them by an iniquitous mode of election which seems to have been planned for the very purpose of defeating the popular will.

On no intelligible grounds, therefore, can the American Republic be called a *free* Government, or, Government by the people, since neither the president wanted nor the relief demanded, was gained by *one hundred thousand majority in a popular election!*

THE DESPOTIC POWERS OF THE PRESIDENT.

At this very moment we have presented to us the spectacle of a man rejected by the majority as unworthy of their votes, filling the executive chair and exercising all the powers of a Cæsar; pursuing a policy in direct antagonism to their known wishes; expelling from offices of trust those in whom the people have expressed confidence, and filling their places with his own partisans; totally irresponsible to the people and their representatives for his acts; surrounded by a ministry taken from the minority and in no way sanctioned by the majority; able to defeat by his veto any and every reform the people's representatives may demand by legislation; controlling the treasury of the nation; commanding the army and navy; having power (in concert with the Senate) to bind the Republic by treaties the people do not want, and to abrogate those they desire continued, even to the danger of involving the country in disastrous foreign war to the

peril of their lives, property, and liberties, and yet they have no more power to restrain his acts than the serfs of Russia have to control the Czar and his council.

THE MINISTRY OR CABINET.

The advisers of the American president are his personal servants selected because of their subserviency to his will, or appointed as a reward for gold given to himself, or contributed to the corruption fund of his party. A. T. Stewart, the New York merchant, gave twenty thousand dollars to President Grant and immediately received a nomination to the secretaryship of the United States Treasury. Wanamaker, the big clothier of Philadelphia, contributed one hundred thousand dollars to Harrison's campaign fund, and straightway was appointed Post-Master-General of the United States. These corrupt and demoralizing practices are so general in all departments of the Government that the people have come to regard them as something to be expected. The corruptions of the old Roman Republic, which reduced her people to slavery and extinguished their liberties in the Empire, were of the same character and no worse than those which exist to-day in the American Republic. To "mart the offices for gold" is so lightly regarded that a speaker of the House of Representatives, who was convicted by a Committee of the House of receiving bribes in his official capacity, was still thought not unworthy of a nomination to the Presidency of the nation and came very near being elected.

The ministry is not taken from the representatives of the people, nor in any way confirmed by them. No vote of the people places them in power, and no vote of the people's representatives in congress can displace them. They owe allegiance only to the presidential autocrat, and so long as they conform to his will, may rule or ruin the country with complete indifference to every other authority.

THE TYRANNIC POWERS OF THE SENATE.

The Senate, too, is a most anomalous body for a free people to tolerate. It is not elected by the people, nor by the people's representatives, but made up of delegates appointed by the several state legislatures. Each state is allowed *two senators* regardless of its size or population. Were these states approximately of the same population there might be no great evil in this, but the widest possible differences exist. For example, Rhode Island appoints two Senators for 276,000 people, and a territory no larger than the County of York, while New York State has only two for a great territory and nearly five millions of people! The same discrepancy exists in regard to Connecticut, New Jersey, and Delaware, while many of the *new* states have less than one hundred thousand population. One of the latest created has only sixty-two thousand, and yet each of these states can nullify the will of the most populous state of the Union. The aggregate population of North and South Dakota, Montana, and Washington is but little more than three hundred thousand—yet, under the enlightened provisions of the American constitution, these four *tenuous outskirts* have power to defeat the will of the people of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois, the four most populous states of the Union, with more than fifteen millions of people!

Had the fathers of the constitution supposed they were establishing, or intended to establish, a great national Government, the people of New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Massachusetts, the then largest and most populous states, would never have consented to give the same senatorial representation to the people of such petty provinces as Delaware, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, as to themselves. What they consented to establish,* and believed they were establishing, was an offensive and defensive league with certain economical and reciprocal advantages which did not impair their state sovereignty beyond

the limited power delegated. Now that these delusions have been dissipated and the several states reduced by the arbitrament of the sword to the condition of provinces of one common Government, the people are beginning to realize that the monstrous powers conferred upon the Senate enable it to defeat all legislation for their relief, practically deprive them of self-government and make it a curse instead of a protection to them.

The Senate claims "co-ordinate" and "co-equal" power with the House of Representatives chosen directly by the people, and not only the same right to originate Bills, but the power and right to prevent all legislation by the representatives of the people, even the passing of tax, tariff and supply Bills, without its royal assent. This enables petty and sparsely populated states containing only *one-fifth* of the population to defeat the wishes of the other *four-fifths*, and, under their written constitution, there is no remedy for this wrong short of civil war.

To illustrate the beauties of this kind of a people's government, the late House of Representatives was in favour of a reduction in the tariff, and passed a measure to effect the desired changes. The Senate said, No; the people shall bear the burdens they have; and the measure became null and void. The late president was in favour of an amicable adjustment of the fisheries dispute, and, in concert with the Canadian and British Governments, negotiated a satisfactory settlement by treaty. That treaty was approved by the people's representatives, but the Senate nullified the will of both people and president.

THE REPUBLIC AN OLIGARCHY.

Under the present interpretation of the constitution by American statesmen, viz., that the people of all the states are citizens and subjects of a common nation, such a body as the present United States Senate renders all pretence of legislature by the people's representatives a farce. The House of Representatives might as well not exist. It has

no real power to do anything, save by permission of the Senate. It has no vital influence over legislation of any kind. It is a shadow without substance or life. All real power rests with the president and the Senate. This makes the republic an *oligarchy* instead of a *democracy*, and like the old Roman commonwealth, it has its *patrician* Senators and its *plebeian* people! And it is for such a government as this that the people of Canada are asked by political tricksters and demagogues to exchange their own wise and evenly-balanced constitution, their substantial liberty, beneficent laws, enlightened administration and honest and unsullied national character!

To rightly estimate the practical working of this American system, in its relation to responsible government and civil liberty, let us suppose that at the end of two years from the last general election, when a new House of Representatives will be chosen by the people—that it has a majority of *one hundred* opposed to the policy of the present administration. On many former occasions it has been nearly two to one. What could it do? It could not get rid of the president or his cabinet ministers. It could not control the administration of the laws. It could not enact any law to relieve the burdens of the people, nor prevent objectionable treaties from being made and ratified. In fact, it would be powerless to do any act for the relief, or better government, or better protection of the people, and any pretence by it of exercising legislative functions would only be a sham and a mockery. There is not another people in the civilized world, unless it be the serfs of Russia, who now endure such a despotism, and even they conspire to overthrow it.

With a majority of his partizans in the Senate (which is in no sense representative of the people, but a creature of the states), the president is an irresponsible despot. There is no act which he may not do with impunity. Every department is in his hands. The treasures of the nation are in the possession of his personal servants—the

military and naval forces are under his command—and he can do whatever he pleases with them. He may turn pirate upon the high seas, freebooter upon the land, send the House of Representatives about their business, and he and the Senate divide and exercise between them all the functions of government.

“What,” do you say, “is there no redress for the people?” Yes, there is one remedy, and one only. The people’s representatives may *impeach* the president and have him tried *before the Senate*. To convict him there must be *two-thirds of the Senate* in favor of the people. Even one less than two-thirds would let him escape. But let us suppose him to be convicted. He would merely be “suspended from office,” and the vice-president, his *chum* and *partner*, would take his place and continue his policy. Impeach and suspend the vice-president and the secretary of state, the *chosen servant* of the president, steps into his shoes and continues the same career. Not much hope for the people in that; and yet, to give them even that much, I have supposed an almost impossible condition, viz., that two-thirds of the senators were opposed to the president. With a majority in his favor and acting in concert with him, no redress whatever for the people exists.

The only government with which the American Republic can be compared is that of Russia. The American gives to the people a semblance of government, but cheats them out of the reality. The Czar is naturally anxious for the contentment of all his people, as it ensures the peace of his reign, and the stability of his dynasty. He is neither partizan nor sectional, but equally the friend of all his slaves, so long as they submit absolutely to his will. The American president is necessarily a partizan—the friend of his supporters and the enemy of all who opposed his election. If any section voted heavily against him that section is sure to experience manifestations of his resentment in objectionable and offensive appointments and in vetoes of legislation intended for their benefit.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

Besides the organic defects of the government which are irreparable without reforming their constitution (to effect any change in which requires that two-thirds of both houses of Congress must demand it, and three-fourths of the states consent to it, conditions almost impossible to attain), there are other evils which directly spring from it of scarcely less magnitude. One of these, which corrupts the very fountain of justice in most if not all the states, is the election of their judges. Neither integrity, learning, dignity of character nor legal attainments can weigh against political availability. No candidate could be elected who was not popular with the saloon element, ward bummers, political hacks and criminal classes, and no party could afford to put him in nomination, for his defeat might endanger its whole ticket. If he possesses the requisite popularity with these classes to render him an available candidate for a political party, he, for that very reason, almost certainly lacks those other qualifications which are necessary to the impartial administration of justice. Once elected he feels that he owes his power to the active politicians of his party, and that they have claims upon his consideration which do not pertain to those of the opposite party who tried to defeat his election. When he accepts the judgeship he gives up his law practice. The term for which he is elected is only for a period of from two to four years. To be defeated at the end of his term and forced to go back to his law practice, would be felt in most cases as a serious misfortune. Therefore he is almost forced by his circumstances to so discharge the duties of the judicial office as to retain the support of the leaders of his party.

Suppose now, what constantly occurs, that one of his chief supporters is engaged in a lawsuit against one of the opposite party and the case comes before him for trial. He is so hampered by his relations to one of the litigants that he can hardly help regarding him as his *friend* and the

other as his *enemy*. His ruling on points of law is partial. His interpretation of statutes strained. In his charge to the jury he belittles the evidence given in support of his enemy, and magnifies that of his partizan, and by such means warps the verdict from the straight line of equity and justice. He is placed in a position which gives him the strongest of motives for being partial, and it is the weakness of human nature to be biassed by self-interest.

Is it any wonder that justice stumbles under such administration—that criminals go unpunished, and life and property are insecure? I have known an American judge in a simple action for the specific performance of a written contract, which should have been disposed of in half an hour after it was reached on his docket—the law, the evidence, and the ruling of courts being of the clearest and most positive character—to keep the case dangling for years because he did not wish to decide it honestly, and when finally forced to make a decision to dismiss the case with costs to the plaintiff, thereby compelling him to appeal to a superior judge to have it reopened and decided on its merits. The infamous decision was reversed, and the dishonest judge sharply rebuked, but it had in the meantime tied up a valuable property for years, depreciated its value, and cost thousands of dollars wrongfully.

Recently a large number of indictments were found against leading Republican politicians, one of whom was a member of the National Executive Committee, for infamous and audacious bribery in the State of Indiana at the last general election. The evidence was of the most damning character, and conviction was sure to follow a fair trial. But the judicial system of the republic was equal to the emergency. The cases were set for hearing before a judge of their own party, who promptly dismissed them all, on a frivolous technicality of his own construction, without permitting the evidence to be even heard.

When it is considered that the men elected to judgeships in the States are not, as a rule, the leading members of the

bar, but needy lawyers of small practice, whose constant fear is that they may be defeated at the end of their term, it will occasion no surprise to learn that, when not governed by partizanship, they are generally open to other influences which make the longest purse almost sure to win.

Another grave defect in the administration of justice is the admitting of appeals from judgments rendered, on the most frivolous grounds. It is hardly possible to get any verdict which will stand. The losing party can appeal from the magistrate to the county-court, from the county-court to the circuit, from the circuit to the appellate, and from the appellate to the supreme court, one after another, in the same case, each of which appeals renders necessary another trial, with heavy costs for witness, court and counsel fees. Thus rich litigants are able to bankrupt those of smaller means, and to win in the end through their default, because of sheer inability to bear the expense.

Bribery is another curse reduced to a system in the States. Wealthy corporations, such as railway companies, keep men regularly employed whose sole duties consist in "*fixing juries.*" A poor man recently received an injury by a cable railway and brought an action to recover damages. The case came to trial and the jury disagreed. A new trial was had and the same thing occurred again. It was set for a third hearing when one of the jurors reported to the court that he had been approached by the offer of a bribe. An investigation took place and it was discovered that for years no jury had rendered a verdict against that particular company for more than nominal damages. They generally stood ten for the complainant and *two* for the company, the two being those bribed to defeat justice. It was further shown that the company kept two scoundrels on large salaries, whose sole duties consisted in bribing jurors in all cases in which the company was defendant. One of these bribers, whom I could call by name, is now rusticated in Canada instead of breaking stones in the penitentiary.

THE INSECURITY OF LIFE IN THE STATES.

Life and property are less protected by law, and consequently more insecure in the United States than in any other civilized country on the face of the globe. There are more murders, cuttings, stabbings, and shootings there in each year than in all the monarchies and republics of Europe combined. I kept for years a diary of those reported by the press, which is very far from including all which occur and found that more capital crimes were committed in the United States every *week* than in Great Britain and Ireland in the *whole year*. Lawless lynchings, for alleged offences, by midnight bands, without trial by judge or jury, are of almost hourly occurrence. Murders openly committed in the presence of witnesses are seldom followed by the execution of the murderer. Business men go about their ordinary avocations, armed with revolvers and bowie knives, feeling forced to rely on their own alertness for safety rather than on the protecting arm of the law.

The following from the *Chicago Times* of July 6, 1889, shows the immunity which exists for murderers in that boastful land of liberty.

"WAUPACA, CHARLESTON, AND CHICAGO.

"Just at present the newspapers of the city are commenting upon the outcome of two murder trials which resulted in the acquittal of the accused, although the evidence against them was of a damning and overwhelming nature. One of these trials occurred at Waupaca, in the neighbouring State of Wisconsin; the other at Charleston, in the State of South Carolina. One trial was heard before a typical western judge and jury; the other before a typical southern judge and jury. The crimes for which the accused stood trial were different only in character; they were equally atrocious.

"The Currans were no more and no less guilty of the murder of Hazeltine than was Dr. McDow of the murder of Dawson.

"But allowing the communities in which these crimes were committed and these murderers were acquitted to enjoy the fruits of this open and brazen disregard of the value of human life and the majesty of the law in the future, perhaps the Chicago papers can find something of a similar nature nearer home to talk about and moralize over.

"How many murders have there been committed in Chicago during the last fifteen years, and how many murderers have there been hanged? How many red-handed assassins have escaped with a light sentence to the penitentiary, and how many have escaped punishment in any shape? Is it true or false that the petty and particularly the friendless thief runs a greater risk of being punished in this city than does the murderer? Is it true or false that not one in fifty murderers has been avenged by the law in this city during the last fifteen years? One more question: Has there been a murderer hanged in Chicago since the great fire who was able to employ the best of counsel, or who had means enough to corrupt a jury?

"The anarchist hanging may be quoted in reply to the last question, but the anarchists were hanged by public opinion, and, it may be said in passing, were found guilty before they were tried.

"It is not necessary for the Chicago newspaper writer or the average citizen of intelligence to go over the files in order to ascertain that this city has a record in the murder line of which she may well feel ashamed. And the most deplorable part of it is that the record is not one that can be referred to as of the past, for it is being added to in the present and in a most startling manner.

"The murder of Peterson at the hands of what is known as "the Market street gang," may not attract as much attention at home or abroad as the murders of Hazeltine and

Dawson, but it was, in fact, more brutal, unprovoked, and atrocious than either of them. Peterson was killed without giving his assailants the slightest cause for committing the crime. It was without a motive other than that which prompts the devil to take control of the actions of a thug. It was without a palliating circumstance.

"It will be interesting and perhaps instructive to watch the course of the law in relation to the brutes who committed this crime. They are known and the principal has confessed. Will he be sentenced to two years in the penitentiary and his pals to a year in the county jail, or will the jury decide that Peterson's death was the result of accident, or caused by heart disease, or that he was killed in self-defence, or that the murderer was crazed by the heat of the sun when he struck the fatal blow?

"Any of these conclusions will not surprise us. We are used to them. But perhaps we had better let Waupaca and Charleston justice alone. That glass-house proverb has a great deal of truth in it."

Is there another people on the face of the earth who would tolerate such a state of things and yet go about boasting of the blessings they enjoy and the perfection of their government? Their perceptions of right and wrong have become so blunted by familiarity with the crimes and corruptions which result from their government that they are unable to see that the protection of life, the security of property, and the impartial administration of justice, are the chief purposes for which governments are instituted, and that any system which does not ensure these is bad and undeserving of their allegiance.

In all governments which secure constitutional liberty to their people—such as is enjoyed in the highest degree in Canada—the executive officers are taken from the representatives of the people, who are the source of all power; the ministry is responsible to their will, and every burden they bear is self-imposed. Nothing of this kind exists in the States. The executive is irresponsible, the ministry is

irresponsible, the majority do not rule, corruption and crime go unpunished, the liberties of the people are ground under the iron heel of despotism, and there is no hope for them short of revolution.

OBSERVANCE OF THE SABBATH DAY.

The effect of the American system on the morals of the people is strikingly illustrated by their observance of the Sabbath. Sunday with them is of all others the day devoted to dissipation. From the opening of spring to the close of autumn the cities pour forth their thousands who go to groves, suburban parks, woods and lakes within a radius of thirty miles, to spend the day in *shooting, fishing, drinking, dancing, and gambling*, and return to town on Sabbath evening singing ribald songs and indulging in all the vulgar rowdyism of drunken men and women. Every railway sends out long train loads of men, women and children on Sunday morning, some of them two or three such trains, to different points along their line, each of which carries a band of music and a plentiful stock of whiskey, beer and cigars. The theatres are open on the leading streets of the city, whiskey and beer can be purchased at almost every street crossing, and many shops are doing a thriving business.

Such is Sunday in all the leading cities of the northern states. Nor must it be imagined that such desecration of the Sabbath is confined to the humbler classes. It permeates everywhere, and is found even among the educated and wealthy.

POKER IN A NEW ROLE.

Some fifty miles from Chicago there is a beautiful sheet of water called Lake Geneva. Its shores are studded with handsome residences—the summer homes of rich *merchants, bankers and manufacturers* of Chicago. These people are

so very *exclusive*, and *refined*, that some years ago they bought up all the land around the lake to keep it from falling into *vulgar hands*, and will now only sell to the *crème de la crème* of their own set, so as to preserve, I suppose, the moral tone of their circle.

Each one of these rich men owns a beautiful steam yacht, fitted up with a luxurious cabin. I was spending some weeks at the town of Geneva for health, and noticed that every Sunday afternoon one of these graceful yachts could be seen lazily steaming around the shores of the lake. As there was no appearance of life on board, nor any apparent object in going so slow, and wind'ing in and out of all the numerous bays, my curiosity was excited, and I enquired what it meant. "Why, don't you know," queried my oarsman, "they are playing poker! They all get on board of one boat, pull down the blinds of the cabin, and play poker every Sunday afternoon all through the summer while their families are up here. To-day it is S.'s yacht, last Sunday it was A.'s, and next Sunday it will be T.'s, and so on. They do this so as not to attract attention to any one particular boat. It was begun, they say, to build the church in the village. They agreed that all the money won by any of the party should go to that holy purpose, but since they have finished the church I don't know whether they have discovered any other religious object to promote by poker, or merely keep it up as a pleasant Sunday recreation."

SUNDAY NEWSPAPERS.

And not to be behind the masses and millionaires in disregarding the sanctity of the Sabbath, the newspapers come out on Sunday morning with the chief edition of the week. Their Sunday papers contain more *business* advertisements, more *personals* of a questionable character, more *scandal* and *pruriency* than any other. The publishers strive to outbid each other for public favour by collecting

and rehashing all the scandal and filth of the previous week, interlarding it with new details, manufactured for the occasion, to give it piquancy. So sharp is the competition in this line that one of the Chicago dailies hit upon a novel plan of getting ahead of his compeers. He hired a special staff of profligate men and women, and sent them out into all the pursuits of a busy city to *gather* and *invent* scandal against merchants, lawyers, doctors, hotels, boarding houses, dressmakers, clubs and gambling hells, and served up their filthy and libellous fictions, with the names of many leading people of the city, on Sunday morning, in addition to the previous week's accumulation of nastiness. The people read these papers before going to church on Sunday morning, and their children are permitted to pore over them throughout the whole Sabbath day. With the theatres running wide open, public picnics parading the streets, saloons and shops engaged in secular business, how is it possible for the young of that land to grow up with any respect for the Lord's day? Bred in an atmosphere of moral contamination, and surrounded during the impressible years of youth by such debasing influences, they reach the ages of manhood and womanhood with no reverence for anything save Mammon and pleasure.

SUNDAY IN CHICAGO.

(From the Chicago Times, July 6, 1889.)

"To-morrow will be Sunday in Chicago. It is well enough to bear this fact in mind, particularly if you intend to pass through any of the main thoroughfares in the three divisions of the old city.

"Sunday in Chicago is the biggest day of the week for the distillers, brewers, saloon-keepers and pot-house loafers. It has grown to be essentially their day. It is theirs by right of conquest and possession.

"They had held a claim upon it for many years, but they secured a clear right and indisputable title to it at the last

city election. To them the question whether the saloon might "run wide open" on Sundays was the one to be decided by ballot at that election, and, as it appears to them now, was settled in their favour.

"They feel that up to the present time they have been very lenient with other citizens, especially so with those who have no very high regard for the traffic in which they are engaged. As victors they might make it more uncomfortable for the respectable portion of the community than they do, did they but choose.

"But they are magnanimous, and if we will just consent to give them free swing on Sundays they will not be too hard upon us.

"You must bear in mind to-morrow that it is Sunday, if you happen to walk or ride through any of the business arteries of the South, West or North sides, for if you don't you are likely to be thrown off your guard. The saloons, concert halls and low dives of every description will be in full blast. During the week days there are screens across the doors. Sundays these screens are taken down in token of the fact that everything is "running wide open" in Chicago.

"It will be a great day for the toughs, thugs, thieves, blacklegs, loafers and saloon-keepers to-morrow if it is fine.

"Decent people should remain indoors Sundays for the present."

Chicago is neither better nor worse than most American cities. She has been called the modern *Sodom* by jealous rivals, who say she was consumed by fire because of the wickedness of her people. Be this as it may, it is certain she was not changed by the chastening, for she arose from her ashes more impious than ever, and has since flourished as though consuming flames were congenial to her people and but served to hasten her progress towards her final destiny—whatever that may be!

LICENSE vs. LIBERTY.

There is something so attractive, to the masses of the American people in their condition, that it makes them boast that their country is the freest in the world. For a long time it was a mystery to me what that something could be, since nothing was discoverable in their institutions to warrant that assumption. Strolling down street one day I met a Canadian of most pronounced antagonism to all the moral and Christian restraints of his own country, who, after our greeting, suddenly exclaimed, "What a free country this is." I ventured to ask him in what particulars he found it so. "Why," said he, "I arrived here on Saturday night, with a letter of introduction to an American friend. We got up early on Sunday morning and the streets were all bustle and excitement, like a fair day at home, with people going to spend the day in the country. My friend and I joined the crowd and went by train to a suburban resort a few miles distant, where there was a park and a river running through a small lake surrounded by rushes. We spent most of the forenoon *duck-shooting*, while others went *fishing*. At twelve o'clock there was a *base-ball match*, which was great fun. After dinner we *danced* with the girls in an open pavilion under the trees to the inspiring strains of a *brass band*. We smoked and drank *whiskey* and *beer* all day long and got back to town in time to attend *the ballet* in the evening. All that on one Sunday. What a jolly free country it is anyway!" I then understood, as I never had before, that in the American sense *freedom* means *license*, or the liberty to do almost anything you please, even to the desecration of the Lord's Day, without anybody thinking it out of place. In that respect I must admit the United States is the most free and easy country among civilized nations.

CANADA A REFUGE FOR RELIGIOUS AMERICANS.

It is impossible not to feel a degree of sympathy for a large and intelligent class of Americans who are able to appreciate the blessings of rational liberty, impartial administration of justice, security of life and property, and a decent observance of the Sabbath, and yet are forced by circumstances to live in a country where all these are wanting. To them Canada is destined to become what the Promised Land was to the afflicted children of Israel—a refuge to which they can flee from governmental misrule and social disorder. There are thousands of Christian people in every large community in the States, who bitterly deplore the contaminating influences by which they are encompassed, but as yet are unwilling to admit that their emancipation cannot be effected by amending their own laws. It is certain however that all efforts in that direction will prove futile. They are so greatly in the minority that they have no power to remove the demoralizing abuses they are subjected to. In their impatience to grow rich, by swelling their population, and garnering the wealth of their resources, they granted privileges which it is now not possible for them to recall. Instead of seeking to attract only industrious and thrifty emigrants from the old world, they threw the door wide open and invited the scum of all nations to come and be endowed with the full rights of American citizenship! What is the consequence? In all the large cities and many of the most populous states, the worst elements of the old world now hold the balance of power in the new. The Christian descendants of the sturdy Puritans find that all power is passing away from them, and they cannot look forward with much hope of ever regaining it. They have lost their birthright and can only repossess it by a political revolution. Once convinced that they must consent to be forever governed by the manners and morals of those by whom they are at present engulfed, they will flow over the border into Canada in a continuous stream, and cast in their lot with a kindred

people, speaking the same language, sprung from the same proud nation, having the same respect for social order, and the same love of civil and religious liberty as themselves.

THE AMERICAN LOVE OF COUNTRY.

With the masses of the American people love of country is no more than an ignorant and unreasoning idolatry, such as Pagan worshippers are said to bestow on graven images. They have been taught, by their school books and by Fourth of July bombastic orations, to believe the people of other countries—and particularly of England and her colonies—oppressed and deprived of constitutional liberty by the despotism of monarchy (!) while they themselves are the freest people on the globe. Educated to believe this stuff in their youth they go through life supposing it to be true, when in reality it is a fiction such as old women retail to children to frighten them from straying beyond the bounds of their nursery. They tell them the green fields and shady woodlands outside, which look so inviting, are the abode of goblins and monsters waiting to destroy and devour them, if they dare to venture forth. The education of American youth, in regard to the government and people of England and Canada, is of the same low standard, and it is therefore not surprising that the goblins and monsters of fiction live in their minds as realities after they become men and women, and tend to make them the more submissive to the real tyrannies and corruptions of their own government. The ignorance in which they are reared concerning all other nations and people is so dense, and their prejudices so cultivated and played upon by designing demagogues, that they are incapable of seeing or believing the truth. The glorious achievements, and heroic deeds of their ancestors, are utterly lost on them. The lessons of history go for nothing. They are being fitted to become slaves while constantly assured that they enjoy the greatest liberty. They are amused with the name of freedom while its reality is insensibly vanishing.

A SUMMARY OF THE DEFECTS OF THEIR GOVERNMENT.

The state governments are much more just to the people and more responsive to their will than the general government. In the former the Governor, the Senate, and the House of Representatives, are all directly elected by the majority, and in most cases the heads of departments also. This makes the *state officials* the choice of the people and places the administration of *local* affairs fairly in accord with their will. The objectionable features are that the Governor is always a bitter partizan, and forced to do many things at the dictation of his party which are not done for the public good, but to subserve party ends; while the state ministers or heads of departments are *wholly irresponsible* for their acts to the people's representatives, and cannot be controlled, or got rid of until their full term expires no matter how corrupt or incompetent they may prove to be.

The constitution of the United States, as interpreted by the leading statesmen of the Republic, construed by the Supreme Court, and affirmed by the Philadelphia convention of 1866, makes the general government absolutely supreme, and the states no more than provinces or districts of one common nation. It has usurped absolute sovereignty over the states which created it; claims and exercises the right to regulate their internal affairs; forces them to change their constitutions, and to admit to the full privileges of citizenship, including the right to vote, an ignorant and inferior race, actually in the majority in many of the states, thereby placing the lives, property, and intelligence of the white citizens of those states under the domination of *negroes*, and has become an irresponsible despotism which may at any moment turn its repressive powers upon the people and extinguish the last vestige of liberty remaining to them. It has, in the opinion of the ablest constitutional historian of the Republic, "*established a precedent which, placed upon the generally assumed basis and followed, subjects*

all the states to a central and irresponsible power and destroys constitutional liberty. For if the government has absolute supremacy over the states that made it, its unlimited rights of taxation and of raising armaments enable it to control all states and all sections of states at will, and finally to establish an empire."—*Republic of Republics.*

CHANGES NECESSARY TO RESTORE LIBERTY TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

To possess constitutional liberty or self-government the American people must be able to control at will every legislative and executive function of their Government.

The President must be their servant, elected by a direct vote of the people, and entitled to the office only because of receiving the greatest number of votes cast for any one candidate. Under the present fraudulent sham of state apportionment he is the President of the *States* and not of the *people*, and is often declared elected when a large majority of the people have recorded their votes against him.

The Congress or parliament must be wholly composed of representatives chosen openly and *equitably* by the people and must have absolute and exclusive control over all legislation affecting their welfare: such as tax and tariff enactments; raising money on the credit of the nation; regulating commerce; providing for naturalization; for the coining of money, fixing its value and punishing those making or issuing spurious imitations; establishing postal regulations; promoting science and the arts; constituting all tribunals of justice; punishing piracy; raising and providing support for military and naval forces, etc., etc., and of all laws necessary for carrying into effect and enforcing its will.

If the legislative powers are divided into two bodies, each must derive its authority direct from the people, and be fairly and openly elected by the majority, or one of the second house must be limited to certain constitu-

tional questions, such as the compact between the States and general Government, or between different States, or between individual States and the Government. For unless it be so elected or so limited, every legislative act it performs in opposition to the House of the Representatives is a violation of the people's right of self-government and dangerous to their liberties.

As at present constituted, the legislative power is divided between two bodies. The House is fairly chosen by the people, but the Senate does not derive its powers from the people, is not elected by their votes, nor does it in any way fairly or equitably represent their interests or rights, since one hundred and forty thousand people in Delaware are given the same control over legislation as five millions in the State of New York, two hundred and seventy-six thousand in Rhode Island exert the same control as five millions in Pennsylvania, or three and a half millions in Ohio, and so on.

Another change in the constitution necessary, if the people are to possess the right of self-government, is that the heads of departments must be taken directly from the people's representatives and must have the confidence of a majority of them at every moment of their official life. They must hold office not for a definite period, nor during the pleasure of the President, but so long as a majority of the people's representatives have confidence in their honesty, and wise and just administration of the affairs of the nation. Their continuance in power must be made to depend on the will of the majority of the people's representatives, or they are in no sense the *servants* of the people, and the people do not rule.

To this *responsible* ministry must be committed the Government of the Republic, with power to make all appointments to office, to execute the laws, negotiate treaties, appoint foreign ambassadors and consuls, declare war, control the military and naval forces, and hold in trust the treasures of the people.

The President must be deprived of the power of vetoing legislation, except by the advice of his responsible ministers: or the people are governed by the President and not by their representatives. He should be no more than the nominal head of the Government, and every executive function performed by him should be done as the mouth-piece of his constitutional advisers—the ministry responsible to the House of Representatives.

WHO THE REAL RULERS OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE.

If the people of the United States *are* sovereign, and *do* rule, as they are constantly told they are and do, then they possess the absolute right of self-government; but if they possess not that right, then they are subjects or slaves, as the case may be, of that higher power which is sovereign and does rule. Their will is expressed in their election of the House of Representatives, to which they commit the protection of their lives, liberty and interests. If the House of Representatives cannot of its inherent right, under the constitution, make laws for their protection, cannot appoint officers to administer the laws, or control those who do administer them, the people do not enjoy civil liberty, have not self-government, and do not rule.

Under the American constitution there are other wills higher than the people's, over which they have no control, and to which theirs is subject. The Senate, although not chosen by the people nor controlled by the people, can and does continually nullify the legislative enactments of the people's representatives; therefore *it is a power above the people*, to which they are subject and forced to submit. The President also is given power to nullify and bring to naught any and every enactment of the people's representatives; therefore he, too, is a higher power than the people—supreme over all; and before the people can perform any

act of self-government they must humbly beg permission of their masters—the Senate and President, the real sovereigns and rulers of the nation.

This much-vaunted constitutional republic is therefore not a government by the people at all. Before the states united they were free and independent, and their people enjoyed self-government and could have easily remedied any and every defect of their governmental system. By entering into the Union they lost the power, if not the right, to control the Acts of the Administration—a safeguard which no people can surrender and preserve their liberties. It is easy to prove, but profitless now to show, that the framers of the constitution did not intend to make any such surrender, and that the convention in agreeing upon it, and the people of the states in ratifying it, did not suppose they were thereby giving up any of their rights of self-government, but it was and is the only practical outcome of such *unions* between independent states, the greater absorbs the less, the many overthrow the few. The Central Government, by arraying the states of the North against those of the South, and fomenting sectional and rival interests, insidiously clothed itself with imperial powers, and now claims and exercises the right of ultimate decision on all questions affecting the states in the Union, and of all questions of the extent of its own authority, so that it may assert a right to any and all powers—to any and everything, in fact, that it covets—and then decide beyond revision in its own favour. Such a government may suit the Americans, but it would not be endured for a day by the free and enlightened people of Canada, who know too well the blessings of responsible government and rational liberty to exchange them for anarchy and misrule under an irresponsible despotism.

I cannot more appropriately close my remarks on the American Republic than by the following quotation, which

shows the drift of many of the best minds in the Union, and their keen appreciation of the radical and apparently incurable defects of their government:—

“ It seems from our recent history advisable to go back to the old faith or the old sovereign, as the American States, by permitting their quondam federal agency or commission to fasten absolutism on them, have provincialized themselves. Would it not be well, in case they do not wish to retake sovereignty, to propose to England a new Anglo-American treaty, and stipulate to be re-incorporated and restored to their ancient provincial privileges in the glorious old commonwealth whose polity, like her flag, has braved a thousand years the battle and the breeze?—a polity, as her fond sons believe, at once free, permanent and unassailable, being, as Tennyson writes,

‘ Broad, based upon the people’s will,
And compassed by the inviolate sea.’ ”

Republic of Republics, page 388.
